

MINIMAL γ -SHEAVES

MANUEL BLICKLE

ABSTRACT. In this note we show that finitely generated unit $\mathcal{O}_X[\sigma]$ -modules for X regular and F -finite have a minimal root (in the sense of [Lyu97] Definition 3.6). This question was asked by Lyubeznik and answered by himself in the complete case. In fact, we construct a minimal subcategory of the category of coherent γ -sheaves (in the sense of [BB06]) which is equivalent to the category of γ -crystals. Some applications to tight closure are included at the end of the paper.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [Lyu97] introduces the category of finitely generated unit $R[\sigma]$ -modules and applies the resulting theory successfully to study finiteness properties of local cohomology modules. One of the main tools in proving results about unit $R[\sigma]$ -modules is the concept of a generator or root. In short, a generator (later on called γ -sheaf) is a finitely generated module M together with a map $\gamma : M \rightarrow \sigma^*M$. By repeated application of σ^* to this map one obtains a direct limit system, whose limit we call $\mathbf{Gen}M$. One checks easily that γ induces an map $\mathbf{Gen}M \rightarrow \sigma^*\mathbf{Gen}M$ which is an isomorphism. A finitely generated unit $R[\sigma]$ -module $\mathcal{M}$ is precisely a module which is isomorphic to $\mathbf{Gen}M$ for some γ -sheaf (M, γ) , it hence comes equipped with an isomorphism $\mathcal{M} \cong \sigma^*\mathcal{M}$. Of course, different γ -sheaves may generate isomorphic unit $R[\sigma]$ -modules so the question arises if there is a unique minimal (in an appropriate sense) γ -sheaf that generates a given unit $R[\sigma]$ -module. In the case that R is complete, this is shown to be the case in [Lyu97] Theorem 3.5. In [Bli04] this is extended to the case that R is local (at least if R is F -finite). The purpose of this note is to prove this in general, i.e for any F -finite regular ring R (see Theorem 2.22). A notable point in the proof is that it does not rely on the hard finiteness result [Lyu97] Theorem 4.2, but only on the (easier) local case of it which is in some sense proven here *en passant* (see Remark 2.13).

The approach in this note is not the most direct one imaginable since we essentially develop a theory of minimal γ -sheaves from scratch (section 2). However, with this theory at hand, the results on minimal generators are merely a corollary. The ideas

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13A35.

During the preparation of this article the author was supported by the *DFG Schwerpunkt Komplexe Geometrie*.

in this paper have two sources. Firstly, the ongoing project [BB06] of the author with Gebhard Böckle lead to a systematic study of γ -sheaves (the notation γ -sheaf is chosen to remind of the notion of a generator introduced in [Lyu97]). Secondly, insight gained from the D -module theoretic viewpoint on generalized test ideals developed in [BMS] lead to the observation that these techniques can be successfully applied to study γ -sheaves.

In the final section 3 we give some applications of the result on the existence of minimal γ -sheaves. First, we show that the category of minimal γ -sheaves is equivalent to the category γ -crystals of [BB06]. We show that a notion from tight closure theory, namely the parameter test module, is a global object (Proposition 3.3). Statements of this type are notoriously hard in the theory of tight closure. Furthermore, we give a concrete description of minimal γ -sheaves in a very simple case (Proposition 3.5), relating it to the generalized test ideals studied in [BMS]. This viewpoint also recovers (and slightly generalizes, with new proofs) the main results of [BMS] and [AMBL05]. A similar generalization, however using different (but related) methods, was recently obtained independently by Lyubeznik, Katzman and Zheng in [KLZ].

Notation. Throughout we fix a *regular* scheme X over a field $k \supseteq \mathbb{F}_q$ of characteristic $p > 0$ (with $q = p^e$ fixed). We further assume that X is F -finite, i.e. the Frobenius morphism $\sigma : X \rightarrow X$, which is given by sending $f \in \mathcal{O}_X$ to f^q , is a finite morphism¹. In particular, σ is affine. This allows to reduce in many arguments below to the case that X itself is affine and I will do so if convenient. We will use without further mention that because X is regular, the Frobenius morphism $\sigma : X \rightarrow X$ is flat such that σ^* is an exact functor (see [Kun69]).

2. MINIMAL γ -SHEAVES

We begin with recalling the notion of γ -sheaves and nilpotence.

Definition 2.1. A γ -sheaf on X is a pair (M, γ_M) consisting of a quasi-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module M and a $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear map $\gamma : M \rightarrow \sigma^*M$. A γ sheaf is called *coherent* if its underlying sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules is coherent.

A γ -sheaf (M, γ) is called *nilpotent* (of order n) if $\gamma^n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma^{n*}\gamma \circ \sigma^{(n-1)*}\gamma \circ \dots \circ \sigma^*\gamma \circ \gamma = 0$ for some $n > 0$. A γ -sheaf is called *locally nilpotent* if it is the union of nilpotent γ subsheaves.

¹It should be possible to replace the assumption of F -finiteness to saying that if X is a k -scheme with k a field that the relative Frobenius $\sigma_{X/k}$ is finite. This would extend the results given here to desirable situations such as X of finite type over a field k with $[k : k^q] = \infty$. The interested reader should have no trouble to adjust our treatment to this case.

Maps of γ -sheaves are maps of the underlying $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules such that the obvious diagram commutes. The following proposition summarizes some properties of γ -sheaves, for proofs and more details see [BB06].

Proposition 2.2. (a) *The set of γ -sheaves forms an abelian category which is closed under extensions.*
 (b) *The coherent, nilpotent and locally nilpotent γ -sheaves are abelian subcategories, also closed under extension.*

Proof. The point in the first statement is that the $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module kernel, co-kernel and extension of (maps of) γ -sheaves naturally carries the structure of a γ -sheaf. This is really easy to verify such that we only give the construction of the γ -structure on the kernel as an illustration. Recall that we assume that X is regular such that σ is flat, hence σ^* is an exact functor. If $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ is a homomorphism of γ -sheaves, i.e. a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & N \\ \gamma_M \downarrow & & \downarrow \gamma_N \\ \sigma^* M & \xrightarrow{\sigma^* \varphi} & \sigma^* N \end{array}$$

which induces a map $\ker \varphi \rightarrow \ker(\sigma^* \varphi)$. Since σ^* is exact, the natural map $\sigma^*(\ker \varphi) \rightarrow \ker(\sigma^* \varphi)$ is an isomorphism. Hence the composition

$$\ker \varphi \rightarrow \ker(\sigma^* \varphi) \xrightarrow{\cong} \sigma^*(\ker \varphi)$$

equips $\ker \varphi$ with a natural structure of a γ -sheaf.

The second part of [Proposition 2.2](#) is also easy to verify such that we leave it to the reader, cf. the proof of [Lemma 2.3](#) below. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *A morphism $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ of γ -sheaves is called nil-injective (resp. nil-surjective, nil-isomorphism) if its kernel (resp. cokernel, both) is locally nilpotent.*

- (a) *If N is coherent and φ is nil-injective (resp. nil-surjective) then $\ker \varphi$ (resp. $\text{coker } \varphi$) is nilpotent.*
- (b) *Kernel and cokernel of φ are nilpotent (of order n and m resp.) if and only if there is, for some $k \geq 0$ ($k = n + m$), a map $\psi : N \rightarrow \sigma^{k*} M$ such that $\gamma_M^k = \psi \circ \varphi$.*
- (c) *If N is nilpotent of degree $\leq n$ (i.e. $\gamma_N^n = 0$) and $N' \subseteq N$ contains the kernel of γ_N^i for $1 \leq i \leq n$, then N' is nilpotent of degree $\leq i$ and N/N' is nilpotent of degree $\leq n - i$.*

Proof. The first statement is clear since X is noetherian. For the second statement consider the diagram obtained from the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow$

$C \rightarrow 0$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & K & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \swarrow \psi & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{n*}K & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{n*}M & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{n*}N & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{n*}C & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow 0 & & \downarrow & & \swarrow \text{dotted} & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{(n+m)*}K & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{(n+m)*}M & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{(n+m)*}N & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{(n+m)*}C & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

If there is ψ as indicated, then clearly the leftmost and rightmost vertical arrows of the first row are zero, i.e. K and C are nilpotent. Conversely, let $K = \ker \varphi$ be nilpotent of degree n and $C = \operatorname{coker} \varphi$ be nilpotent of degree m . Then the top right vertical arrow and the bottom left vertical arrow are zero. This easily implies that there is a dotted arrow as indicated, which will be the sought after ψ .

For the last part, the statement about the nilpotency of N' is trivial. Consider the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N' \rightarrow N \rightarrow N/N' \rightarrow 0$ and the diagram one obtains by considering $\sigma^{(n-i)*}$ and σ^{n*} of this sequence.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & N' & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & N/N' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow \gamma^{n-i} & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{(n-i)*}N' & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{(n-i)*}N & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{(n-i)*}(N/N') & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow 0 & & \downarrow \sigma^{(n-i)*}\gamma^i & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{n*}N' & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{n*}N & \longrightarrow & \sigma^{n*}(N/N') & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

The composition of the middle vertical map is γ_N^n which is zero by assumption. To conclude that the top right vertical arrow is zero one uses the fact that $\sigma^{(n-i)*}N' \supseteq \sigma^{(n-i)*}\ker \gamma^i = \ker(\sigma^{(n-i)*}\gamma^i)$. With this it is an easy diagram chase to conclude that the top right vertical map is zero. $\square$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $M \xrightarrow{\varphi} N$ be a map of γ -sheaves. Let $N' \subseteq N$ be such that N/N' is nilpotent (hence $N' \subseteq N$ is a nil-isomorphism). Then $M/(\varphi^{-1}N')$ is also nilpotent.*

Proof. If φ is injective/surjective, the Snake Lemma shows that $M/(\varphi^{-1}N')$ injects/surjects to N/N' . Now split φ into $M \twoheadrightarrow \operatorname{image} \varphi \hookrightarrow N$. $\square$

If (M, γ) is a γ -sheaf, then σ^*M is naturally a γ -sheaf with structural map $\sigma^*\gamma$. Furthermore, the map $\gamma : M \rightarrow \sigma^*M$ is then a map of γ -sheaves which is a *nil-isomorphism*, i.e. kernel and cokernel are nilpotent. We can iterate this process to obtain a directed system

$$(2.1) \quad M \xrightarrow{\gamma} \sigma^*M \xrightarrow{\sigma^*\gamma} \sigma^{2*}M \xrightarrow{\sigma^{2*}\gamma} \dots$$

whose limit we denote by $\mathbf{Gen}M$. Clearly $\mathbf{Gen}M$ is a γ -sheaf whose structural map $\gamma_{\mathbf{Gen}M}$ is injective. In fact, it is an isomorphism since clearly $\sigma^*\mathbf{Gen}M \cong \mathbf{Gen}M$. Note that even if M is coherent, $\mathbf{Gen}M$ is generally not coherent. Furthermore, let $\overline{M}$ be the image of M under the natural map $M \rightarrow \mathbf{Gen}M$. Then, if M is coherent, so is $\overline{M}$ and the map $M \rightarrow \overline{M}$ is a nil-isomorphism. Since $\overline{M}$ is a γ -submodule of $\mathbf{Gen}M$ whose structural map is injective, the structural map $\overline{\gamma}$ of $\overline{M}$ is injective as well.

Proposition 2.5. *The operation that assigns to each γ -sheaf M its image $\overline{M}$ in $\mathbf{Gen}M$ is an end-exact functor (preserves exactness only at the end of sequences) from $\mathbf{Coh}_\gamma(X)$ to $\mathbf{Coh}_\gamma(X)$. The kernel $M^\circ = \bigcup \ker \gamma_M^i$ of the natural map $M \rightarrow \overline{M}$ is the maximal (locally) nilpotent subsheaf of M .*

Proof. The point is that one has a functorial map between the exact functors $\text{id} \rightarrow \mathbf{Gen}$. An easy diagram chase shows that the image of such a functorial map is an end-exact functor (see for example [Kat96, 2.17 Appendix 1]). The verification of the statement about M° left to the reader. $\square$

Such γ -submodules with injective structural map enjoy a certain minimality property with respect to nilpotent subsheaves:

Lemma 2.6. *Let (M, γ) be a γ -sheaf. The structural map γ_M is injective if and only if M does not have a non-trivial nilpotent subsheaf.*

Proof. Assume that the structural map of M is injective. This implies that the structural map of any γ -subsheaf of M is injective. But a γ -sheaf with injective structural map is nilpotent if and only it is zero.

Conversely, $\ker \gamma_M$ is a nil-potent subsheaf of M . If γ_M is not injective it is non-trivial. $\square$

2.1. Definition of minimal γ -sheaves.

Definition 2.7. A coherent γ -sheaf M is called *minimal* if the following two conditions hold.

- (a) M does not have nontrivial nilpotent subsheaves.
- (b) M does not have nontrivial nilpotent quotients.

A simple consequence of the definition is

Lemma 2.8. *Let M be a γ -sheaf. If M satisfies (a) then any γ -subsheaf of M also satisfies (a). If M satisfies (b) then so does any quotient.*

Proof. Immediate from the definition. $\square$

As the preceding Lemma 2.6 shows, (a) is equivalent to the condition that the structural map γ_M is injective. We give a concrete description of the second condition.

Proposition 2.9. *For a coherent γ -sheaf M , the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) *M does not have nontrivial nilpotent quotients.*
- (b) *For any map of γ -sheaves $\varphi : N \rightarrow M$, if $\gamma_M(M) \subseteq \varphi(\sigma^*N)$ (as subsets of σ^*M) then φ is surjective.*

Proof. I begin with showing the easy direction that (a) implies (b): Note that the condition $\gamma_M(M) \subseteq \varphi(\sigma^*N)$ in (b) precisely says that the induced structural map on the cokernel of $N \rightarrow M$ is the zero map, thus in particular $M/\varphi(N)$ is a nilpotent quotient of M . By assumption on M , $M/\varphi(N) = 0$ and hence $\varphi(N) = M$.

Let $M \twoheadrightarrow C$ be such that C is nilpotent. Let $N \subseteq M$ be its kernel. We have to show that $N = M$. The proof is by induction on the the order of nilpotency of C (simultaneously for all C). If $C = M/N$ is nilpotent of order 1 this means precisely that $\gamma(M) \subseteq \sigma^*N$, hence by (b) we have $N = M$ as claimed. Now let N be such that the nilpotency order of $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M/N$ is equal to $n \geq 2$. Consider the γ -submodule $N' = \pi^{-1}(\ker \gamma_C)$ of M . This N' clearly contains N and we have that $M/N' \cong C/(\ker \gamma_C)$. By the previous [Lemma 2.3](#) we conclude that the nilpotency order of M/N' is $\leq n-1$. Thus by induction $N' = M$. Hence $M/N = N'/N \cong \ker \gamma_C$ is of nilpotency order 1. Again by the base case of the induction we conclude that $M = N$. $\square$

These observations immediately lead to the following corollary.

Corollary 2.10. *A coherent γ -sheaf M is minimal if and only if the following two conditions hold.*

- (a) *The structural map of M is injective.*
- (b) *If $N \subseteq M$ is a subsheaf such that $\gamma(M) \subseteq \sigma^*N$ then $N = M$.*

The conditions in the Corollary are essentially the definition of a *minimal root* of a finitely generated unit $R[\sigma]$ -module in [\[Lyu97\]](#). The finitely generated unit $R[\sigma]$ -module generated by (M, γ) is of course $\text{Gen}M$. Lyubeznik shows in the case that R is a complete regular ring, that minimal roots exist. In [\[Bli04, Theorem 2.10\]](#) I showed how to reduce the local case to the complete case if R is F -finite. For convenience we give a streamlined argument of the result in the local case in the language of γ -sheaves.

2.2. Minimal γ -sheaves over local rings. The difficult part in establishing the existence of a minimal root is to satisfy condition (b) of [Definition 2.7](#). The point is to bound the order of nilpotency of any nilpotent quotient of a fixed γ -sheaf M .

Proposition 2.11. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be regular, local and F -finite. Let M be a coherent γ -sheaf and N_i be a collection of γ -sub-sheaves which is closed under finite intersections and such that M/N_i is nilpotent for all i . Then $M/\bigcap N_i$ is nilpotent.*

Proof. Since R is regular, local and F -finite, R is via σ a free R -module of finite rank. Hence σ^* is nothing but tensorisation with a free module of finite rank. Such an operation commutes with the formation of inverse limits such that $\sigma^* \bigcap N_i = \bigcap (\sigma^* N_i)$ and hence $\bigcap N_i$ is a γ -subsheaf of M . Clearly we may replace M by $M / \bigcap N_i$ such that we have $\bigcap N_i = 0$. By faithfully flatness of completion M is nilpotent if and only if $\hat{R} \otimes_R M$ is a nilpotent γ -sheaf over $\hat{R}$ (and similar for all M/N_i). Hence we may assume that $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is complete. We may further replace M by its image $\overline{M}$ in $\text{Gen}M$. Thus we may assume that M has injective structural map $\gamma : M \subseteq \sigma^* M$. We have to show that $M = 0$.

By the Artin-Rees Lemma (applied to $M \subseteq \sigma^* M$) there exists $t \geq 0$ such that for all $s > t$

$$M \cap \mathfrak{m}^s \sigma^* M \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{s-t} (M \cap \mathfrak{m}^t \sigma^* M) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{s-t} M .$$

By Chevalley's Theorem in the version of [Lyu97, Lemma 3.3], for some $s \gg 0$ (in fact $s \geq t + 1$ will suffice) we find N_i with $N_i \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^s M$. Possibly increasing s we may assume that $N_i \not\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{s+1} M$ (unless, of course $N_i = 0$ in which case $M/N_i = M$ is nilpotent $\Rightarrow M = 0$ since γ_M is injective, and we are done). Combining these inclusions we get

$$\begin{aligned} N_i &\subseteq \sigma^* N_i \cap M \subseteq \sigma^* (\mathfrak{m}^s M) \cap M \\ &\subseteq (\mathfrak{m}^s)^{[q]} \sigma^* M \cap M \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{sq} \sigma^* M \cap M \\ &\subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{sq-t} M . \end{aligned}$$

But since $sq - t \geq s + 1$ for our choice of $s \geq t + 1$ this is a contradiction (to the assumption $N_i \neq 0$) and the result follows. $\square$

Corollary 2.12. *Let R be regular, local and F -finite and M a coherent γ -sheaf. Then M has a nil-isomorphic subsheaf without non-zero nilpotent quotients (i.e. satisfying (b) of the definition of minimality). In particular, M is nil-isomorphic to a minimal γ -sheaf.*

Proof. Let N_i be the collection of all nil-isomorphic subsheaves of M . This collection is closed under finite intersection: If N and N' are two such, then Lemma 2.4 shows that $N \cap N'$ is a nil-isomorphic subsheaf of N . Since composition of nil-isomorphisms are nil-isomorphisms it follows that $N \cap N' \subseteq M$ is a nil-isomorphism as well.

Since M is coherent each M/N_i is indeed nilpotent such that we can apply Proposition 2.11 to conclude that $M / \bigcap N_i$ is nilpotent. Hence $N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap N_i$ is the unique smallest nil-isomorphic subsheaf of M . It is clear that N cannot have non-zero nilpotent quotients (since the kernel would be a strict subsheaf of N , nil-isomorphic to M , by Proposition 2.2 (b)).

By first replacing M by $\overline{M}$ we can also achieve that condition (a) of the definition of minimality holds. As condition (a) passes to subsheaves, the smallest nil-isomorphic subsheaf of $\overline{M}$ is the sought after minimal γ -sheaf which is nil-isomorphic to M . $\square$

Remark 2.13. Essentially the same argument as in the proof of [Proposition 2.11](#) shows the following: If R is local and M is a coherent γ -sheaf over R with injective structural map, then any descending chain of γ -submodules of M stabilizes. This was shown (with essentially the same argument) in [\[Lyu97\]](#) and implies immediately that γ -sheaves with injective structural map satisfy DCC.

If one tries to reduce the general case of [Corollary 2.12](#) (i.e. R not local) to the local case just proven one encounters the problem of having to deal with the behavior of the infinite intersection $\bigcap N_i$ under localization. This is a source of troubles I do not know how to deal with directly. The solution to this is to take a detour and realize this intersection in a fashion such that each term functorially depends on M and furthermore that this functorial construction commutes with localization. This is explained in the following section.

2.3. $D_X^{(1)}$ -modules and Frobenius descent. Let D_X denote the sheaf of differential operators on X . This is a sheaf of rings on X which locally, on each affine subvariety $\text{Spec } R$ is described as follows.

$$D_R = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} D_R^{(i)}$$

where $D_R^{(i)}$ is the subset of $\text{End}_{\mathbb{F}_q}(R)$ consisting of the operators which are linear over R^{q^i} , the subring of $(q^i)^{\text{th}}$ powers of elements of R . In particular $D_R^{(0)} \cong R$ and $D_R^{(1)} = \text{End}_{R^q}(R)$. Clearly, R itself becomes naturally a left $D_R^{(i)}$ -module. Now denote by $R^{(1)}$ the $D_R^{(1)}$ - R -bi-module which has this left $D_R^{(1)}$ -module structure and the right R -module structure via Frobenius. i.e. for $r \in R^{(1)}$ and $x \in R$ we have $r \cdot x = rx^q$. With this notation we may view $D_R^{(1)} = \text{End}_R^r(R^{(1)})$ as the right R -linear endomorphisms of $R^{(1)}$. Thus we have

$$\sigma^*(_) = R^{(1)} \otimes_R _ : R\text{-mod} \rightarrow D_R^{(1)}\text{-mod}$$

which makes σ^* into an equivalence of categories from R -modules to $D_R^{(1)}$ -modules (because, since σ is flat and R is F -finite, $R^{(1)}$ is a locally free right R -module of finite rank). Its inverse functor is given by

$$(2.2) \quad \sigma^{-1}(_) = \text{Hom}_R^r(R^{(1)}, R) \otimes_{D_R^{(1)}} _ : D_R^{(1)}\text{-mod} \rightarrow R\text{-mod}$$

For details see [\[AMBL05, Section 2.2\]](#). I want to point out that these constructions commute with localization at arbitrary multiplicative sets. Let S be a multiplicative

set of R .² We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 S^{-1}D_R^{(1)} &= S^{-1}\text{End}_R^r(R^{(1)}) \\
 (2.3) \quad &= \text{End}_{S^{-1}R}^r((S^{[q]})^{-1}R^{(1)}) = \text{End}_{S^{-1}R}^r((S^{-1}R)^{(1)}) \\
 &= D_{S^{-1}R}^{(1)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we have for an $D_R^{(1)}$ -module M :

$$\begin{aligned}
 S^{-1}(\sigma^{-1}M) &= S^{-1}(\text{Hom}_R^r(R^{(1)}, R) \otimes_{D_R^{(1)}} M) \\
 &= S^{-1}\text{Hom}_R^r(R^{(1)}, R) \otimes_{S^{-1}D_R^{(1)}} S^{-1}M \\
 &= \text{Hom}_{S^{-1}R}^r((S^{-1}R)^{(1)}, S^{-1}R) \otimes_{D_{S^{-1}R}^{(1)}} S^{-1}M \\
 &= \sigma^{-1}(S^{-1}M)
 \end{aligned}$$

These observations are summarized in the following Proposition

Proposition 2.14. *Let X be F -finite and regular. Let U be an open subset (more generally, U is locally given on $\text{Spec } R$ as $\text{Spec } S^{-1}R$ for some (sheaf of) multiplicative sets on X). Then*

$$(D_X^{(1)})|_U = D_U^{(1)}$$

and for any sheaf of $D_X^{(1)}$ -modules M one has that

$$(\sigma^{-1}M)|_U = (\text{Hom}^r(\mathcal{O}_X^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}_X) \otimes_{D_X^{(1)}} M)|_U \cong \text{Hom}^r(\mathcal{O}_U^{(1)}, \mathcal{O}_U) \otimes_{D_U^{(1)}} M|_U = \sigma^{-1}(M|_U)$$

as $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules.

2.4. A criterion for minimality. The Frobenius descent functor σ^{-1} can be used to define an operation on γ -sheaves which assigns to a γ -sheaf M its smallest γ -subsheaf N with the property that M/N has the trivial ($=0$) γ -structure. This is the opposite of what the functor σ^* does: $\gamma : M \rightarrow \sigma^*M$ is a map of γ sheaves such that $\sigma^*M/\gamma(M)$ has trivial γ -structure.

We define the functor σ_γ^{-1} from γ -sheaves to γ -sheaves as follows. Let $M \xrightarrow{\gamma} \sigma^*M$ be a γ sheaf. Then $\gamma(M)$ is an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -submodule of the $D_X^{(1)}$ -module σ^*M . Denote by $D_X^{(1)}\gamma(M)$ the $D_X^{(1)}$ -submodule of σ^*M generated by $\gamma(M)$. To this inclusion of $D_X^{(1)}$ -modules

$$D_X^{(1)}\gamma(M) \subseteq \sigma^*M$$

²Since $S^{-1}R = (S^{[q]})^{-1}R$ we may assume that $S \subseteq R^q$. This implies that S is in the center of $D_R^{(1)}$ such that localization in this non-commutative ring along S is harmless. With this I mean that we may view the localization of the left R -module $D_R^{(1)}$ at S^{-1} in fact as the localization of $D_R^{(1)}$ at the central multiplicative set $(S^{[q]})^{-1}$

we apply the Frobenius descent functor $\sigma^{-1} : D_X^{(1)}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ defined above in [Equation 2.2](#) and use that $\sigma^{-1} \circ \sigma^* = \text{id}$ to define

$$\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma^{-1}(D_X^{(1)}\gamma(M)) \subseteq \sigma^{-1}\sigma^* M = M$$

In general one has $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}(\sigma^* M) = \sigma^{-1}D_X^{(1)}\sigma^*(\gamma)(\sigma^* M) = \gamma(M)$ since $\sigma^*(\gamma)(\sigma^* M)$ already is a $D_X^{(1)}$ -subsheaf of the $D_X^{(2)}$ -module $\sigma^*(\sigma^* M) = \sigma^{2*} M$.

By construction $\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M \subseteq M \xrightarrow{\gamma} \gamma(M) \subseteq D_X^{(1)}\gamma(M) = \sigma^*\sigma^{-1}D_X^{(1)}\gamma(M) = \sigma^*\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M$ such that $\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M$ is a γ -subsheaf of M .

Furthermore, the quotient $M/\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M$ has zero structural map. One makes the following observation

Lemma 2.15. *Let M be a γ sheaf. Then $\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M$ is the smallest subsheaf N of M such that $\sigma^* N \supseteq \gamma(M)$.*

Proof. Clearly $\sigma^{-1} M$ satisfies this condition. Let N be as in the statement of the Lemma. Then $\sigma^* N$ is a $D_X^{(1)}$ -subsheaf of $\sigma^* M$ containing $\gamma(M)$. Hence $D_X^{(1)}\gamma(M) \subseteq \sigma^* N$. Applying σ^{-1} we see that $\sigma^{-1} M \subseteq N$. $\square$

Therefore, the result of the lemma could serve as an alternative definition of σ_γ^{-1} (one would have to show that the intersection of all such N has again the property that $\gamma(M) \subseteq \sigma^* \bigcap N$ but this follows since σ^* commutes with inverse limits). The following lemma is the key point in our reduction to the local case. It is an immediate consequence of [Proposition 2.14](#). Nevertheless we include here a proof using only the characterization of [Lemma 2.15](#). Hence one may avoid the appearance of $D^{(1)}$ -modules in this paper altogether but I believe it to be important to explain where the ideas for the arguments originated, hence $D^{(1)}$ -modules are still there.

Lemma 2.16. *Let M be a γ sheaf and let $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$ be multiplicative set. Then $S^{-1}(\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M) = \sigma_\gamma^{-1}(S^{-1} M)$.*

Proof. This follows from [Proposition 2.14](#). However, this can also be proven using only the characterization in [Lemma 2.15](#): By this we have

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma^*(S^{-1}(\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M)) = S^{-1}(\sigma^*(\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M)) \supseteq S^{-1}\gamma(M) = \gamma(S^{-1} M)$$

which implies that $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}(S^{-1} M) \subseteq S^{-1}(\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M)$ because $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}(S^{-1} M)$ is smallest (by [Lemma 2.15](#)) with respect to the inclusion shown in the displayed equation [Equation 2.4](#). On the other hand one has the chain of inclusions

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^*(M \cap S^{-1}\sigma_\gamma^{-1}(M)) &= \sigma^* M \cap \sigma^*\sigma_\gamma^{-1}(S^{-1} M) \\ &\supseteq \sigma^* M \cap \gamma(S^{-1} M) \supseteq \gamma(M) \end{aligned}$$

and hence [Lemma 2.15](#) applied to M yields

$$\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M \subseteq M \cap S^{-1}\sigma_\gamma^{-1}(M).$$

Therefore $S^{-1}\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M \subseteq S^{-1}M \cap S^{-1}(\sigma_\gamma^{-1}S^{-1}M) = \sigma_\gamma^{-1}S^{-1}M$ which finishes the argument. $\square$

Proposition 2.17. *Let M be a γ -sheaf. Then $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M = M$ if and only if M has no proper nilpotent quotients (i.e. satisfies condition (b) of the definition of minimality)*

If M is coherent. The condition on $x \in X$ that the inclusion $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}(M_x) \subseteq M_x$ is equality is an open condition on X .

Proof. One direction is clear since $M/\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M$ is a nilpotent quotient of M . We use the characterization in Proposition 2.9. For this let $N \subseteq M$ be such that $\gamma(M) \subseteq \sigma^*N$. $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M$ was the smallest subsheaf with this property, hence $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M \subseteq N \subseteq M$. Since $M = \sigma_\gamma^{-1}M$ by assumption it follows that $N = M$. Hence, by Proposition 2.9, M does not have non-trivial nilpotent quotients.

By Lemma 2.16 σ_γ^{-1} commutes with localization which means that $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}(M_x) = (\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M)_x$. Hence the second statement follows simply since both M and $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M$ are coherent (and equality of two coherent modules via a given map is an open condition). $\square$

Lemma 2.18. *The assignment $M \mapsto \sigma_\gamma^{-1}M$ is an end-exact functor on γ -sheaves.*

Proof. Formation of the image of the functorial map $\text{id} \xrightarrow{\gamma} \sigma^*$ of exact functors is end-exact (see for example [Kat96, 2.17 Appendix 1]). If M is a $D_X^{(1)}$ -module and $A \subseteq B$ are $\mathcal{O}_X$ -submodules of M then $D_X^{(1)}A \subseteq D_X^{(1)}B$. If $M \twoheadrightarrow N$ is a surjection of $D^{(1)}$ -modules which induces a surjection on $\mathcal{O}_X$ -submodules $A \twoheadrightarrow B$ then, clearly, $D_X^{(1)}A$ surjects onto $D_X^{(1)}B$. Now one concludes by observing that σ^{-1} is an exact functor. $\square$

Lemma 2.19. *Let $N \subseteq M$ be an inclusion of γ -sheaves such that $\sigma^{n*}N \supseteq \gamma^n(M)$ (i.e. the quotient is nilpotent of order $\leq n$). Then $\sigma^{(n-1)*}(N \cap \sigma_\gamma^{-1}M) \supseteq \gamma^{n-1}(\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M)$.*

Proof. Consider the γ -subsheaf $M' = (\gamma^{n-1})^{-1}(\sigma^{(n-1)*}N)$ of M . One has

$$\sigma^*M' = (\sigma^*\gamma^{n-1})^{-1}(\sigma^{n*}N) \supseteq \gamma(M)$$

by the assumption that $\gamma^n(M) \subseteq \sigma^{n*}N$. Since $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M$ is minimal with respect to this property we have $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M \subseteq (\gamma^{n-1})^{-1}(\sigma^{(n-1)*}N)$. Applying γ^{n-1} we conclude that $\gamma^{n-1}(\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M) \subseteq \sigma^{(n-1)*}N$. Since $\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M$ is a γ -sheaf we have $\gamma(\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M) \subseteq \sigma^{(n-1)*}(\sigma_\gamma^{-1}M)$ such that the claim follows. $\square$

2.5. Existence of minimal γ -sheaves. For a given γ -sheaf M we can iterate the functor σ_γ^{-1} to obtain a decreasing sequence of γ -subsheaves

$$\dots \subseteq M_3 \subseteq M_2 \subseteq M_1 \subseteq M(\xrightarrow{\gamma} \sigma^*M \rightarrow \dots)$$

where $M_i = \sigma_\gamma^{-1}M_{i-1}$. Note that each inclusion $M_i \subseteq M_{i-1}$ is a nil-isomorphism.

Proposition 2.20. *Let M be a coherent γ -sheaf. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) *M has a nil-isomorphic γ -subsheaf $\underline{M}$ which does not have non-trivial nilpotent quotients (i.e. $\underline{M}$ satisfies condition (b) in the definition of minimal γ -sheaf).*
- (b) *M has a unique smallest nil-isomorphic subsheaf (equiv. M has a (unique) maximal nilpotent quotient).*
- (c) *For some $n \geq 0$, $M_n = M_{n+1}$.*
- (d) *There is $n \geq 0$ such that for all $m \geq n$, $M_m = M_{m+1}$.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Let $\underline{M} \subseteq M$ be the nil-isomorphic subsheaf of part (a) and let $N \subseteq M$ be another nil-isomorphic subsheaf of M . By Lemma 2.4 it follows that $\underline{M} \cap N$ is also nil-isomorphic to M . In particular $\underline{M}/(\underline{M} \cap N)$ is a nilpotent quotient of $\underline{M}$ and hence must be trivial. Thus $N \subseteq \underline{M}$ which shows that $\underline{M}$ is the smallest nil-isomorphic subsheaf of M .

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c): Let N be this smallest subsheaf as in (b). Since each M_i is nil-isomorphic to M , it follows that $N \subseteq M_i$ for all i . Let n be the order of nilpotency of the quotient M/N , i.e. $\gamma^n(M) \subseteq \sigma^{n*}N$. Repeated application (n times) of Lemma 2.19 yields that $M_n \subseteq N$. Hence we get $N \subseteq M_{n+1} \subseteq M_n \subseteq N$ which implies that $M_{n+1} = M_n$.

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (d) is clear.

(d) $\Rightarrow$ (a) is clear by Proposition 2.17. □

This characterization enables us to show the existence of minimal γ -sheaves by reducing to the local case which we proved above.

Theorem 2.21. *Let M be a coherent γ -sheaf. There is a unique subsheaf $\underline{M}$ of M which does not have non-trivial nilpotent quotients.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.20 it is enough to show that the sequence M_i is eventually constant. Let U_i be the subset of X consisting of all $x \in X$ on which $(M_i)_x = (M_{i+1})_x (= (\sigma_\gamma^{-1} M_i)_x)$. By Proposition 2.17 U_i is an open subset of X (in this step I use the key observation Proposition 2.14) and that $(M_i)|_{U_i} = (M_{i+1})|_{U_i}$. By the functorial construction of the M_i 's the equality $M_i = M_{i+1}$ for one i implies equality for all bigger i . It follows that the sets U_i form an increasing sequence of open subsets of X whose union is X itself by Corollary 2.12 and Proposition 2.20. Since X is noetherian, $X = U_i$ for some i . Hence $M_i = M_{i+1}$ such that the claim follows by Proposition 2.20. □

Theorem 2.22. *Let M be a coherent γ -sheaf. Then there is a functorial way to assign to M a minimal γ -sheaf $M_{\min}$ in the nil-isomorphism class of M .*

Proof. We may first replace M by the nil-isomorphic quotient $\overline{M}$ which satisfies condition (a) of Definition 2.7. Then replace $\overline{M}$ by its minimal nil-isomorphic submodule

$(\overline{M})$ which also satisfies condition (b) of [Definition 2.7](#) (and condition (a) because (a) is passed to submodules). Thus the assignment $M \mapsto M_{\min} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\overline{M})$ is a functor since it is a composition of the functors $M \mapsto \overline{M}$ and $M \mapsto \underline{M}$. $\square$

Proposition 2.23. *If $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ is a nil-isomorphism, then $\varphi_{\min}: M_{\min} \rightarrow N_{\min}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Clearly, $\varphi_{\min}$ is a nil-isomorphism. Since $\ker \varphi_{\min}$ is a nilpotent subsheaf of $M_{\min}$, we have by [Definition 2.7](#) (a) that $\ker \varphi_{\min} = 0$. Since $\text{coker } \varphi_{\min}$ is a nilpotent quotient of $N_{\min}$ it must be zero by [Definition 2.7](#) (b). $\square$

Corollary 2.24. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a finitely generated unit $\mathcal{O}_X[\sigma]$ -module. Then M has a unique minimal root in the sense of [\[Lyu97\]](#).*

Proof. Let M be any root of $\mathcal{M}$, i.e. M is a coherent γ -sheaf such that γ_M is injective and $\text{Gen} M \cong \mathcal{M}$. Then $M_{\min} = \underline{M}$ is a minimal nil-isomorphic γ -subsheaf of M by [Theorem 2.22](#). By [Corollary 2.10](#) it follows that $M_{\min}$ is the sought after minimal root of $\mathcal{M}$. $\square$

Note that the only assumption needed in this result is that X is F -finite and regular. In particular it does not rely on the finite-length result [\[Lyu97\]](#) Theorem 3.2 which assumes that R is of finite type over a regular local ring (however it does not assume F -finiteness).

Theorem 2.25. *Let X be regular and F -finite. Then the functor*

$$\text{Gen}: \mathbf{Min}_{\gamma}(X) \rightarrow \text{finitely generated unit } \mathcal{O}_X[\sigma]\text{-modules}$$

is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. The preceding corollary shows that Gen is essentially surjective. The induced map on Hom sets is injective since a map of minimal γ -sheaves f is zero if and only if its image is nilpotent (since minimal γ -sheaves do not have nilpotent submodules) which is the condition that $\text{Gen}(f) = 0$. It is surjective since any map between $g: \text{Gen}(M) \rightarrow \text{Gen}(N)$ is obtained from a map of γ -sheaves $M \rightarrow \sigma^{e*}N$ for some $e \gg 0$. But this induces a map $M = M_{\min} \rightarrow (\sigma^{e*}N)_{\min} = N_{\min} = N$. $\square$

3. APPLICATIONS AND EXAMPLES

In this section we discuss some further examples and applications of the results on minimal γ -sheaves we obtained so far.

3.1. γ -crystals. The purpose of this section is to quickly explain the relationship of minimal γ -sheaves to γ -crystals which were introduced in [BB06]. The category of γ -crystals is obtained by inverting nil-isomorphisms in $\mathbf{Coh}_\gamma(X)$. In [BB06] it is shown that the resulting category is abelian. One has a natural functor

$$\mathbf{Coh}_\gamma(X) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{Crys}_\gamma(X)$$

whose fibers we may think of consisting of nil-isomorphism classes of M . Note that the objects of $\mathbf{Crys}_\gamma(X)$ are the same as in $\mathbf{Coh}_\gamma(X)$, however a morphism between γ -crystals $M \rightarrow N$ is represented by a left-fraction, i.e. a diagram of γ -sheaves $M \leftarrow M' \rightarrow N$ where the arrow $\leftarrow$ is a nil-isomorphism.

On the other hand we just constructed the subcategory of minimal γ -sheaves $\mathbf{Min}_\gamma(X) \subseteq \mathbf{Coh}_\gamma(X)$ and showed that there is a functorial splitting $M \mapsto M_{\min}$ of this inclusion. An immediate consequence of Proposition 2.23 is that if M and N are in the same nil-isomorphism class, then $M_{\min} \cong N_{\min}$. The verification of this may be reduced to considering the situation

$$M \leftarrow M' \Rightarrow N$$

with both maps nil-isomorphisms in which case Proposition 2.23 shows that $M_{\min} \cong M'_{\min} \cong N_{\min}$. One has the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let X be regular and F -finite. Then the composition*

$$\mathbf{Min}_\gamma(X) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Coh}_\gamma(X) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{Crys}_\gamma(X)$$

is an equivalence of categories whose inverse is given by sending a γ -crystal represented by the γ -sheaf M to the minimal γ -sheaf $M_{\min}$.

Proof. The existence of $M_{\min}$ shows that $\mathbf{Min}_\gamma(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Crys}_\gamma(X)$ is essentially surjective. It remains to show that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Min}_\gamma}(M, N) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Crys}_\gamma}(M, N)$. A map $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ of minimal γ -sheaves is zero in $\mathbf{Crys}_\gamma$ if and only if $\mathrm{image} \varphi$ is nilpotent. But $\mathrm{image} \varphi$ is a subsheaf of the minimal γ -sheaf N , which by Definition 2.7 (a) has no nontrivial nilpotent subsheaves. Hence $\mathrm{image} \varphi = 0$ and therefore $\varphi = 0$. This shows that the map on Hom sets is injective. The surjectivity follows again by functoriality of $M \mapsto M_{\min}$. $\square$

Corollary 3.2. *Let X be regular and F -finite. The category of minimal γ -sheaves $\mathbf{Min}_\gamma(X)$ is an abelian category. If $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ is a morphism then $\ker_{\min} \varphi = (\ker \varphi)_{\min} = \underline{\ker \varphi}$ and $\mathrm{coker}_{\min} \varphi = (\mathrm{coker} \varphi)_{\min} = \overline{\mathrm{coker} \varphi}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{Min}_\gamma(X)$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{Crys}_\gamma(X)$ and since the latter is abelian, so is $\mathbf{Min}_\gamma(X)$. This implies also the statement about $\ker$ and coker . $\square$

3.2. The parameter test module. We give an application to the theory of tight closure. In [Bli04] Proposition 4.5 it was shown that the parameter test module τ_{ω_A} is the unique minimal root of the intersection homology unit module $\mathcal{L} \subseteq H_I^{n-d}(R)$ if $A = R/I$ is the quotient of the regular local ring R (where $\dim R = n$ and $\dim A = d$). Locally, the parameter test module τ_{ω_A} is defined as the Matlis dual of $H_m^d(A)/0_{H_m^d(A)}^*$ where $0_{H_m^d(A)}^*$ is the tight closure of zero in $H_m^d(A)$. The fact that we are now able to construct minimal γ -sheaves globally allows us to give a global candidate for the parameter test module.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $A = R/I$ where R is regular and F -finite. Then there is a submodule $L \subseteq \omega_A = \text{Ext}^{n-d}(R/I, R)$ such that for each $x \in \text{Spec } A$ we have $L_x \cong \tau_{\omega_x}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq H_I^{n-d}(R)$ be the unique smallest submodule of $H_I^{n-d}(R)$ which agrees with $H_I^{n-d}(R)$ on all smooth points of $\text{Spec } A$. $\mathcal{L}$ exists by [Bli04] Theorem 4.1. Let L be a minimal generator of $\mathcal{L}$, i.e. a coherent minimal γ -sheaf such that $\text{Gen } L = \mathcal{L}$ which exists due to Theorem 2.21. Because of Proposition 2.14 it follows that L_x is also a minimal γ -sheaf and $\text{Gen } L_x \cong \mathcal{L}_x$. But from [Bli04] Proposition 4.5 we know that the unique minimal root of $\mathcal{L}_x$ is $\tau_{\omega_{A_x}}$, the parameter test module of A_x . It follows that $L_x \cong \tau_{\omega_{A_x}}$ by uniqueness. To see that $L \subseteq \text{Ext}^{n-d}(R/I, R)$ we just observe that $\text{Ext}^{n-d}(R/I, R)$ with the map induced by $R/I^{[q]} \rightarrow R/I$ is a γ -sheaf which generates $H_I^{n-d}(R)$. Hence by minimality of L we have the desired inclusion. $\square$

3.3. Test ideals and minimal γ -sheaves. We consider now the simplest example of a γ -sheaf, namely that of a free rank one R -module $M(\cong R)$. That means that via the identification $R \cong \sigma^* R$ the structural map

$$\gamma : M \cong R \xrightarrow{f \cdot} R \cong \sigma^* R \cong \sigma^* M$$

is given by multiplication with an element $f \in R$. It follows that γ^e is given by multiplication by $f^{1+q+\dots+q^{e-1}}$ under the identification of $\sigma^{e*} R \cong R$.

We will show that the minimal γ -subsheaf of the just described γ -sheaf M can be expressed in terms of generalized test ideals. We recall from [BMS] Lemma ?? that the test ideal of a principal ideal (f) of exponent $\alpha = \frac{m}{q^e}$ is given by

$$\tau(f^\alpha) = \text{smallest ideal } J \text{ such that } f^m \in J^{[q^e]}$$

by Lemma ?? of op. cit. $\tau(f^\alpha)$ can also be characterized as σ^{-e} of the $D^{(e)}$ -module generated by f^m . We set as a shorthand $J_e = \tau(f^{(1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{e-1})/q^e})$ and repeat the definition:

$$J_e = \text{smallest ideal } J \text{ of } R \text{ such that } f^{1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{e-1}} \in J^{[q^e]}$$

and further recall from [section 2.5](#) that

$$M_e = \text{smallest ideal } I \text{ of } R \text{ such that } f \cdot M_{e-1} \subseteq I^{[q]}$$

with $M_0 = M$.

Lemma 3.4. *For all $e \geq 0$ one has $J_e = M_e$.*

Proof. The equality is true for $e = 1$ by definition. We first show the inclusion $J_e \subseteq M_e$ by induction on e .

$$\begin{aligned} M_e^{[p^e]} &\supseteq (f \cdot M_{e-1})^{[q^{e-1}]} = (f^{q^{e-1}} M_{e-1}^{[q^{e-1}]}) \\ &= (f^{q^{e-1}} J_{e-1}^{[q^{e-1}]}) \supseteq f^{q^{e-1}} \cdot f^{1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{e-2}} \\ &= f^{1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{e-1}} \end{aligned}$$

since J_e is minimal with respect to this inclusion we have $J_e \subseteq M_e$.

Now we show for all $e \geq 1$ that $f \cdot J_{e-1} \subseteq J_e^{[q]}$. The definition of J_e implies that

$$f^{1+q+\dots+q^{e-2}} \in (J^{[q^e]} : f^{q^{e-1}}) = (J^{[q]} : f)^{[q^{e-1}]}$$

which implies that $J_{e-1} \subseteq (J^{[q]} : f)$ by minimality of J_{e-1} . Hence $f \cdot J_{e-1} \subseteq J^{[q]}$. Now, we can show the inclusion $M_e \subseteq J_e$ by observing that by induction one has

$$J_e^{[q]} \supseteq f \cdot J_{e-1} \supseteq f \cdot M_{e-1}.$$

which implies by minimality of M_e that $M_e \subseteq J_e$. □

This shows that the minimal γ -sheaf $M_{\min}$, which is equal to M_e for $e \gg 0$ by [Proposition 2.20](#), is just the test ideal $\tau(f^{(1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{e-1})/q^e})$ for $e \gg 0$. As a consequence we have:

Proposition 3.5. *Let M be the γ -sheaf given by $R \xrightarrow{f \cdot} R \cong \sigma^* R$. Then $M_{\min} = \tau(f^{(1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{e-1})/q^e})$ for $q \gg 0$. In particular, $M_{\min} \supseteq \tau(f^{\frac{1}{q-1}})$ and the F -pure-threshold of f is $\geq \frac{1}{q-1}$ if and only if M is minimal.*

Proof. For $e \gg 0$ the increasing sequence of rational numbers $(1 + q + q^2 + \dots + q^{e-1})/q^e$ approaches $\frac{1}{q-1}$. Hence $M_e = \tau(f^{(1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{e-1})/q^e}) \supseteq \tau(f^{\frac{1}{q-1}})$ for all e . If M is minimal, then all M_e are equal hence the multiplier ideals $\tau(f^\alpha)$ must be equal to R for all $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{q-1})$. In particular, the F -pure-threshold of f is $\geq \frac{1}{q-1}$. Conversely, if the F -pure threshold is less than $\frac{1}{q-1}$, then for some e we must have that $\tau(f^{(1+q+q^2+\dots+q^{e-1})/q^e}) \neq \tau(f^{(1+q+q^2+\dots+q^e)/q^{e+1}})$ such that $M_e \neq M_{e+1}$ which implies that $M \neq M_1$ such that M is not minimal. □

Remark 3.6. This shows also, after replacing f by f^r , that $\frac{r}{q-1}$ is not an accumulation point of F -thresholds of f for any f in an F -finite regular ring. In [BMS] this was shown for R essentially of finite type over a local ring since our argument there depended on [Lyu97] Theorem 4.2. Even though D -modules appear in the present article, they only do so by habit of the author, as remarked before, they can easily be avoided.

Remark 3.7. Of course, for $r = q - 1$ this recovers (and slightly generalizes) the main result in [AMBL05].

Remark 3.8. I expect that this descriptions of minimal roots can be extended to a more general setting using the modifications of generalized test ideals to modules as introduced in the preprint [TT07].

REFERENCES

- [AMBL05] Josep Alvarez-Montaner, Manuel Blickle, and Gennady Lyubeznik, *Generators of D -modules in positive characteristic*, Math. Res. Lett. **12** (2005), no. 4, 459–473. [1](#), [2.3](#), [3.7](#)
- [BB06] Manuel Blickle and Gebhard Böckle, *Cartier Crystals*, in preparation, 2006. ([document](#)), [1](#), [2](#), [3.1](#)
- [Bli04] Manuel Blickle, *The intersection homology D -module in finite characteristic*, Math. Ann. **328** (2004), 425–450. [1](#), [2.1](#), [3.2](#), [3.2](#)
- [BMS] Manuel Blickle, Mircea Mustața, and Karen E. Smith, *F -thresholds of hypersurfaces*. [1](#), [3.3](#), [3.6](#)
- [Kat96] Nicholas M. Katz, *Rigid local systems.*, Annals of Mathematical Studies, 139. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1996. [2](#), [2.4](#)
- [KLZ] Mordechai Katzman, Gennady Lyubeznik, and Wenliang Zhang, *On the discreteness and rationality of jumping coefficients*. [1](#)
- [Kun69] E. Kunz, *Characterization of regular local rings in characteristic p* , Amer J. Math. **91** (1969), 772–784. [1](#)
- [Lyu97] Gennady Lyubeznik, *$\mathcal{F}$ -modules: an application to local cohomology and D -modules in characteristic $p > 0$* , Journal für reine und angewandte Mathematik **491** (1997), 65–130. ([document](#)), [1](#), [2.1](#), [2.2](#), [2.13](#), [2.24](#), [2.5](#), [3.6](#)
- [TT07] Shunsuke Takagi and Ryo Takahashi, *D -modules over rings of F -finite representation type*, preprint, 2007. [3.8](#)

MATHEMATIK ESSEN, UNIVERSITÄT DUISBURG-ESSEN, 45117 ESSEN, GERMANY
E-mail address: `manuel.blickle@uni-due.de`
URL: `www.mabli.org`